DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 362 95 EA 008 002

AUTHOR Pemberton, S. MacPherson
TITLE The National Institute of Education: A Brief Historical Overview.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 73
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Agencies; *Educational History; *Educational Research; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Government (Administrative Body); Institutional Role; Research and Development Centers
IDENTIFIERS National Institute of Education; NIE; NIE Archives

ABSTRACT

The change in the role and responsibility of the federal government in education and educational research is traced from the creation of the Office of Education (OE) in 1867 to the National Institute of Education (NIE) in 1972. Developments discussed include the task forces of the 1960's and their recommendations, the national program of educational laboratories, regional research and development centers, and various branches of OE and their functions. The conception of NIE is followed through its evolution, objectives, budget, organizational structure, legislative enactment, and first year of operation. NIE activities summarized are (1) the development of new initiatives, including a field-initiated studies program; (2) the development of organizational structures and the hiring of qualified staff; (3) research and exploratory studies, including the continuation of 16 Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC); and (4) international efforts. (MLF)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119362

# The National Institute of Education: A Brief Historical Overview

by

S. MacPherson Pemberton

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 008 002

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C.

November, 1973

The National Institute of Education:
A Brief Historical Overview

I. The Background

A. The Influence of the 1954 Cooperative Research Act.

The National Instiute of Education is a great landmark in the history of American education. When the Office of Education was created in 1867 the basic mission was to "promote the cause of American education." That mission has remained unchanged. But the conception of the role and responsibility of the Federal Government in education and educational research has changed as the creation of the Institute in 1972 clearly indicates.

By mid-twentieth century, in addition to its historic role of collecting and disseminating information describing the state of American education, the Office of Education was assuming new responsibilities. These new responsibilities reflected a change in public conviction of more active participation by the Federal Government in education. In 1950 Congress enacted Public Laws 815 and 874, authorizing Federal payments for the construction, maintenance and operation of public elementary and secondary schools.

Such action by the Federal Government was bound to affect other areas in education and educational research. Gradually the need for research, analysis and study of educational problems was sharply felt as a means of providing better service to organized education. The American people, as expressed through Congress, were becoming more and more

convinced that a stronger Federal Government role in education will augment and strengthen the activities of State and local governments in their historic role of directing the force of American education.

The Cooperative Research Act of 1954, i.e., Public Law 531, was a major step in the direction of increased Federal interest in educational research. The act authorized the Office of Education to "enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys and demonstrations in the field of education."[1] The Cooperative Research Program stemming from this act was launched in 1956 when funds were appropriated, its purpose being the development of new knowledge about major educational problems. In 1957 Herbert S. Conrad, Acting Assistant Commissioner for Research at the Office of Education, expressed the hope that the educational research fostered by the program would be as significant and rewarding as "the research in colleges and universities supported by the National Institutes of Health."[2]

Through the enactment of Public Law 85-864 in 1958, which aimed at improving the quality of instruction and developing highly trained manpower, Congress clearly demonstrated its acknowledgement of the existence of

---

[1]Public Law 531, Chapter 576 (83d Congress, 2d Sess.) An Act to Authorize Cooperative Research in Education.

[2]U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Education, Cooperative Research Projects, 1957, VII.

identifiable national interest in education. This increased participation in education by the Federal Government was the basis of recommendations for a Bureau of Educational Research and Development made by the Committee on Mission and Organization of the Office of Education in 1961. "This Bureau," the Report stated, "would serve as the center of virtually all agency activities designed to assist organized education through the mediums of study, analysis, and dissemination of findings on current educational problems."[3] One important aspect of the recommendation which had implications for the creation of the National Institute of Education a decade later was the idea of making the research bureau separate from other funded educational programs.

B. Task Forces of the 1960s and their recommendations.

During the decade of the 1960s several developments gave sustenance to the idea of new institutional arrangements for educational research which would culminate into the creation of the National Institute of Education. In 1964 the Gardner Task Force on Higher Education in its report to President Lyndon B. Johnson recommended Federal aid for the establishment of large scale National Educational Laboratories which would develop and disseminate ideas and programs for improving educational

---

[3]U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Education, A Federal Education Agency for the Future, Report of the Committee on Mission and Organization of the Office of Education, (1961), p. 10.

practices throughout the country.[4] The White House Task Force on Education, 1965, headed by Dwight A. Ink recommended a new Bureau of Research training and research dissemination programs.[5]

The report of the Interagency Task Force in 1966 stressed that research and development is capable of being as important an element in improvement of higher education as it has proved itself in other great industries and national enterprises. The Task Force therefore recommended substantial increase for educational research and development. Althought the Friday Task Force of 1967 was ignored on many counts, it, too, urged greater Federal aid to research and development in education.[6]

The work of these task forces was not without significante for the legislation of the 1960's which greatly affected education and educational research. The proposals of the Gardner Task Force Report of 1964, became the central features of the Higher Education Act as well as of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Title IV of the ESEA amended the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, to authorize the development of regional research and development laboratories and centers to develop and demonstrate educational innovations. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) was established at the same time for the purpose of collecting and disseminating research information to the

---

[4] Gardner Task Force on Higher Education, 1964, p. 34.

[5] Recommendations of the White House Task Force on Education, 1965.

[6] Chronicle of Higher Education, February 2, 1972.

educational community. These and other research activities were carried out by the Bureau of Research.

C. The Bureau of Research (1965), renamed the National Center for Educational Research and Development (1969).

The largest portion of the responsibilities for sponsoring research and related activities through the Office of Education was delegated to the Bureau of Research which was created in 1965. The Bureau operated under authority given to the Office of Eduation by the provisions of the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and Title II B of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Bureau operated two important programs: The Research and Development Centers Program and the Regional Laboratories Program. These programs were intended to consolidate research activities, to bridge the gap between research and practice and to encourage greater involvement of the disciplines in the study of education. The Bureau of Research was renamed the National Center for Educational Research and Development in 1969. By 1969 government wide demands for accountability and for management according to output resulted in the decision to plan to "target" a significant portion of the research program.

A remarkable development stemming from Title IV of the ESEA of 1965 was the birth of the National Program of Educational Laboratories. The program was designed to identify educational problems, to create new institutions to conduct educational research, to train needed personnel for educational research and to assure educational improvements by implementing that research. It is important to note that the laboratories which were

initially established to cater to regional needs gradually began to concern themselves with national needs as well, and were beginning to work toward interlaboratory communication and coordination of their programs in order to complement and supplement each other. The National Laboratory for Early Childhood Education (1965) assumed leadership in research and development for improving the education of young children.

Like the National Program of Educational Laboratories, the movement toward consolidation and centralization was evident in the operations of the Research and Development Centers Branch of the Office of Education. That branch was responsible for administering the research and development centers established under a program in 1963 authorized by the Cooperative Research Act. The program developed in part from a concern that research efforts were too fragmentary and non-cumulative. The Federal Government through its centers and laboratories was demonstrating its intent to help the States and local districts improve education for all Americans by strengthening research and development activities. While the central mission of the R&D centers was to conduct research on significant educational problems, that of the laboratory program was to speed up the pace of intelligent application and widespread utilization of research results.

Four prime areas were selected as targets or priorities: early childhood, reading, vocational education, and school organization and administration. Higher education was later added. Within each area the

major focus was to be on the needs of the disadvantaged. The NCERD programs had five goals and objectives:

1. To improve the knowledge and theory basis for decision-making in education.
2. To develop promising materials, programs, and techniques to enhance teaching and learning.
3. To broaden R&D participation by practitioners, young scholars, and scientists from various disciplines.
4. To build comprehensive institutional resources for comprehensive and continuous research and development to improve education.
5. To further the preparation of specialist personnel needed to carry out problem analysis, development, evaluation, and other R&D functions.

These were formidable objectives. It is true that the work of the Bureau of Research made significant additions to the body of knowledge available for construction of curricula and the general improvement of teaching-learning processess. By 1968, it was noted that the strong research and development system which was projected in 1965 was in danger of fulfilment. One of the central problems in research and development planning was the failure to attract leading scholars. The National Laboratory for Early Childhood Education created in 1967 was an attempt to surmount this problem. Early childhood accepted as an area requiring

multidisciplinary study provided opportunities for scholars from the various disciplines. The mission of the laboratory, to assume leadership in research and development for improving the education of children through eight years of age, was a precedent and good example of the new Federal role in education that was gradually emerging.

## II. The Idea of a National Institute of Education

On October 20, 1968, Presidential Candidate Richard M. Nixon, announced in a national campaign radio speech that if elected he would create a National Institute for the Educational Future. Its purpose was "to serve as a clearinghouse for ideas in elementary and secondary education and explore the revolutionary possibilities that modern science and technology are making available to education."[7] In 1970 President Nixon's Message on Education Reform expressed the need for a new Federal Education agency. He proposed the creation of a National Institute of Education, the purpose of which "would be to begin the serious, systematic search for new knowledge needed to make educational opportunity truly equal."[8]

---

[7]From a White House Memorandum for Daniel P. Moynihan, dated October 14, 1969.

[8]Message on Education Reform, President Richard M. Nixon March 3, 1970. A Proposed Organization for Research in Education, Advisory Board on Education, National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D. C., 1958.

The President's proposal was the culmination of ideas, suggestions, and recommendations dating back over a decade ago. In 1958 an advisory board of the National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council recommended the establishment of an Organization for Research in Education comparable to the National Institute of Mental Health. In 1964 the Panel on Educational Research and Development of the President's Science Advisory. Committee in its report called for "new institutional arrangements...for the initiation and management of new research programs and for the dissemination of results."[9]

One of the major recommendations of the Commission on Instructional Technology in 1969 was that a new Federal education agency be set up to provide leadership and focus for concerted action. Sterling McMurrin, Chairman of that Commission stated in a hearing before the Select Sub-committee on Education in 1970 that the proposed National Institutes of Education would have "broad authorization to support and fund greatly strengthened programs in educational research development and application."[10] A proposal for the development of National Institutes of Education comparable to the National Institutes of Health was also made by

---

[9]Innovation and Experiment in Education, Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Washington, D. C., 1964.

[10]Educational Technology Act of 1969, Hearing Before the Select Sub-committee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representives, 1970.

David Krathwohl in his address to the American Educational Research Association in 1969.[11] In that same year Professor Lindley J. Stiles, Northwestern University, in a statement on Policy and Perspectives called for the creation of National Institutes of Education consisting of a central coordinating staff to focus on critical educational problems.[12]

The trend toward consolidation and centralization of efforts in educational research was expressed in a recommendation made by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. The committee was concerned that only a small fraction of one percent of the nations total investment was spent on research, development and innovation. It recommended, that a National Commission on Research, Innovation and Evaluation in Education be established to help bring about more effective methods of instruction. Unlike the other suggestions, however, this would be a non-governmental agency established by Congress with the power to receive and spend both government and private funds.[13] By this time the point was well made that there was dire need for a stronger national thrust if there must be advances in education and educational research.

---

[11]Krathwohl, D. R., Educational Research: Perspective Prognosis and Proposal, Presidential Address American Education Research Association, Los Angeles, February 6, 1969.

[12]Lindley J. Stiles, "Policy and Perspectives," The Journal of Educational Research, December, 1969.

[13]The New York Times, July 21, 1968, p. 11.

These proposals for a National Institute of Education were strengthened by the weaknesses and failures of educational research and development in the United States. First, the level of funding for the laboratories and R&D centers and for sponsored research under the Cooperative Research Act was quite inadequate. Second, educational research and development carried out by the Federal Government lacked coherence and had become rather cumbersone. Third, problems were caused by the complexity of educational research and development coupled with the scattered and splintering nature of educational governance in the United States. These factors presented a crying need for a new Federal educational research agency to stimulate new levels of funding, a new kind of structure, and new emphasis upon scientific inquiry of the educational process and the effective diffusion of educational innovations.

III. Establishing the Institute

A. The National Institute of Education Act (1971)

The climate seemed ripe in 1970 for greater Federal action in improving education in the United States through systematic research. Following President Nixon's message to Congress in March 1970 a bill to create a National Institute of Education was introduced. The bill outlined the creation of a National Institute of Education similar to the National Institutes of Health as a focus for educational research, evaluation,

experimentation and dissemination.[14] However, no action was taken then, as the Ninety-first Congress adjourned. Meanwhile James Allen, Commissioner of Education left and the Office of Education requested a delay of hearing for a while. The bill, slightly revised was re-introduced in the Ninety-second Congress in January, 1971. The bill stipulates that the main functions of the Institute include conducting educational research, collecting and disseminating the findings of educational research and training individuals in educational research.[15]

Throughout the discussions and deliberations in the sessions of the Committee on Education and Labor on the Higher Education Act of 1971, some four factors were given special attention. First, absolute consideration was given to the separation of the National Institute of Education from the Office of Education. Among the reasons advanced by the committee was that "placing research and development in a separate agency allows that agency's leadership to adjust normal administrative patterns to fit the special character of a research and development agency."[16]

The second factor hinges on that of separation from the Office of Education. This involves the directorship of the Institute. Proposals

---

[14]Congressional Record - Senate, Vol. 116 #31, S2821, March 3, 1970.

[15]A Bill to Establish a National Institute of Education, and for Other Purposes, S. 434 92nd Congress, 1st Session, January 29, 1971.

[16]92nd Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives Report No. 92-554.

made to the Committee on Education and Labor that the Director of the Institute report to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education were considered and rejected.[17] In the end a compromise was arrived at between the House and Senate providing that the Director of the Institute will report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Education.[18]

The third factor which was given serious consideration was dissemination. The view was advanced that the principal responsibility for the dissemination of research should remain with the Office of Education. The Committee on Education and Labor considered and rejected this view. The dissemination of the results of research and development was, therefore, to be one of the main responsibilities.[19] This was expected to be one of the most important tasks of the Institute, to enable educational consumers to obtain knowledge of new approaches to learning and teaching. The Office of Education was expected to have only a modest share of dissemination activities serving both agencies.

The Office of Education, unhappy over the decision concerning dissemination fought back for a while and made plans to expand its dissemination efforts by introducing "centers for educational renewal." These

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Public Law 92-318, 92nd Congress, S. 659, June 23, 1972.

[19] 92nd Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 92-554.

centers were to include the National Center for Educational Communication and the National Center for Educational Statistics which operate local educational renewal sites. The renewal effort of 1971 was to be geared toward problem-solving at the community level. The Office of Education hoped to achieve this goal through better management of resources as well as through effective dissemination of information.

The renewal strategy was a major effort on the part of the Office of Education to retain a significant aspect of the total research effort. The design was that the research products of the National Institute of Education would be delivered through the renewal program to the places that needed them most.[20] But this effort was opposed in Congress and did not materialize. Thus essentially all Office of Education responsibilities concerned with systematic efforts to gain new knowledge relating to education or to develop and explore new approaches to education were to be transferred to the National Institute of Education.

B. The Levien Report

The Rand Corporation Study, headed by Roger Levien was a follow-up of President Nixon's proposal in March 1970 for the creation of a National Institute of Education and the introduction of the NIE Bill in Congress at that time. The report stated that the money and authority of the National

---

[20]Congressional Record - Senate, February 28, 1972.

Center for Educational Research and Development should be transferred to the proposed Institute. The new agency would be modeled after the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health and would be a separate organization parallel to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

A wide range of questions had been raised as the bill lay in Congress. These included the objectives, programs, organization, relationship with the educational community, and initial activities of the proposed Institute. The Rand Report stated the objectives of the Institute, among them being the alleviation of problems in American Education and the strengthening of the foundations of education. Assuming that Congress would authorize the formation of the Institute, the report pointed to four major issues with which it would be faced:

A. What should its initial program be?

B. How can it acquire first-quality staff?

C. How large should its budget be?

D. How should the transfer of responsibilities from the National Center for Educational Research and Development to the National Institute of Education occur?[21]

---

[21]National Institute of Education: Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institute, Roger Levien, Study Director. A Report prepared for Department of Health, Education and Welfare, February 1971.

These four issues were also basic to the hearing on the NIE Bill. The Levien Report had already warned that "the most important and difficult choices to be made in creating the NIE are those that determine its program." It suggested four program areas to coincide with the four objectives of the Institute: (1) Solution of major educational problems; (2) Advancing educational practice; (3) Strengthening education's foundations; and (4) strengthening the research and development system.

The question of how large the annual budget of the proposed Institute should be was an important one. The concensus prevailed that there must be substantial increase in the funding of educational research. Roger Levien was criticized by Hendrik Gideonse for suggesting that educational research is inherently less expensive than research in other fields. The Levien Report suggested that the annual budget for educational research should be about 1.1 billion dollars. Hendrik Gideonse suggested that it should be between two and three billion dollars.[22] This would raise the cost of the R&D function to as much as 3 or 4 percent of the annual expenditures for education in the coming years.

The costs and benefits of educational research and development were of paramount concern to the Select Sub-Committee on Education, which

---

[22]Hearings before the Select Sub-committee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-second Congress, First Session on H.R. 33, H.R. 3606, and Other Related Bills, February-June 1971, p. 233.

through seeking to deepen its understanding of these matters, organized a study of a number of institutions in Paris, Oslo, London, and Warsaw and Krakow, Poland in April and August 1971. The committee reported that while the patterns of educational research in Europe are not immediately transferable to the United States, yet American researchers will find allies abroad and that perhaps American scholars can gain from the application of Piaget's ideas in French child development centers. Congressman Lloyd Meeds also noted that the National Institute of Education could be utilized as a clearinghouse of educational innovation not only in the United States but also to institutions abroad. [23]

C. The Education Admendments Act of 1972

The National Institute of Education was legally established by the Education Amendments Act of 1972. Passed by the Senate on May 24 and by the House on June 8, it was signed into law on June 23, 1972. The Act stated that "the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the educational process."[24] The Act further stated that the Institute which shall consist of a National Council on Educational Research and a Director,

---

[23]Educational Research in Europe, Report of the Select Sub-Committee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, December 1971, p. 14.

[24]Public Law 92-318, Sec. 405(a)(1), June 23, 1972, p. 93.

shall seek to improve education in the United States through--

"A. Helping to solve or to alleviate the problems and achieve the objectives of American Education;

"B. Advancing the practice of education, as an art, science and profession;

"C. The strengthening of the scientific and technological foundations of education; and

"D. Building an effective research and development system.[25]

The National Council on Educational Research consisting of fifteen members were appointed by President Nixon and confirmed by the Senate on June 7, 1973. The responsibilities of the Council includes establishing general policies for, and reviewing the conduct of the Institute, and advising the Assistant Secretary and the Director of the Institute on Development of Programs to be carried out by the Institute. The Director of the Institute, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate is responsible to the Assistant Secretary, and reports through him to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. There is a Deputy Director who is also appointed by the President.

The Director is authorized through the Institute, "to conduct educational research; collect and disseminate the findings of educational research; train individuals in educational research; assist and foster

---

[25]Op. cit. p. 94.

such research collection, dissemination, or training through grants, or technical assistance to, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with, public or private organizations, institutions, agencies, or individuals; promote the coordination of such research and research support within the Federal Government; and may construct or provide (by grant or otherwise for such facilities as he determines may be required to accomplish such purposes.[26]

The appointment of Emerson Elliott on August 1, 1972 as Acting Director, marked the official beginning of the National Institute of Education. About 80 people were transferred to the Institute from the Office of Education. Programs, valued at about $100 million were also transferred from the Office of Education. These included career education model development, experimental schools, researcher training, education laboratories and regional R&D centers of the National Center for Educational Research and Development, the dissemination activities of the National Center for Educational Communication, and the basic and applied studies of the Division of Research. The President nominated Thomas K. Glennan, Jr. former director of planning, research and evaluation at the Office of Economic Opportunity as the first NIE Director. He was confirmed by the Senate and sworn in on November 1, 1972.

---

[26]Op. cit., p. 95.

IV. Early Planning

Planning for the National Institute of Education began immediately following President Nixon's message in 1970. Reference has already been made to the Levien Report on a preliminary plan for the proposed Institute. Other plans proceeded simultaneously with Congressional debate. In the winter of 1971, Sidney Marland, U. S. Commissioner of Education organized an NIE Planning Unit, headed by Harry Silberman, Director of the National Center for Educational Research and Development. A steering committee was formed later, comprising officials from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Office of Education; the Office of Management and Budget; and the Office of Science and Technology.

The NIE Planning Unit directed by Harry Silberman was charged with two major responsibilities: (1) organization planning and (2) program planning. In the realm of program planning, the task fell to the Planning Unit to identify and analyze problems in American education and to arrive at a substantial number of R&D program alternatives for the Institute. The Planning Unit developed a conceptual framework that consisted of three target areas: (1) education for the disadvantaged; (2) quality of education; and (3) effectiveness of resource use.

One of the strategies adopted by the Planning Unit involved the examination of problems and goals of education, and suggested program priorities for NIE through a thorough analysis and amplification of issues and recommendations made by disciplinary groups and R&D experts. Most of

the programs proposed as a result of such examination fell into three main categories: (1) activities that produce or collect information and disseminate results; (2) activities designed largely to improve practices in the current educational system; and (3) programs addressing major problems which would result in new forms of education that do not necessarily depend upon the current system to operate.

The planning was done by problem-oriented task forces consisting of first-rate professionals also drawn from a variety of disciplines. Early in 1972, the Planning Units' interim report called for an NIE organization of nine units: (1) National Advisory Council with responsibility for NIE's general policies; (2) Office of the Director whose major responsibilities should be related to decision-making, management and reporting, and coordination of the work of the Institute; (3) Policy Research and Program Planning Unit to serve as a "think tank" operation to conduct policy research, to analyze problems, and to propose new R&D program alternatives; (4) Evaluation Unit to provide data on how well all current programs are operating; (5) External Relations Unit to coordinate NIE activities with other Federal agencies, Congress and professional interest groups; (6) Office of Directed Programs aimed at developing alternative solutions to help solve educational problems; (7) Office of Practices for programs aimed primarily at improving the art and the science of teaching; (8) Office of Resource Development to manage programs on basic research, researcher training, and instutional development; (9) Office of Administrative Services

to provide personnel, procurement, fiscal and general services for the Institute.

The Planning Unit also outlined eight new program possibilities: (1) A program in the area of access to adjust inequities in educational spending; (2) A program in the area of access to provide educational services for poorly served clients; (3) A program in the area of decision-making to foster community involvement in education through community vouchers; (4) A program in the area of decision-making for experimenting with alternative voting techniques; (5) A program in the area of productivity to effect the unbundling of higher education; (6) A program in the area of productivity to stimulate greater technology in education; (7) A program in the area of substance for the development of theme schools or alternative schools; (8) A program in the area of substance to increase the authenticity of learning experiences through the use of community resources.

In the section on the transfer of programs from the Office of Education to the National Institute of Education, the report also indicated the sharp difference that was to mark the research activities of each agency. Essentially, Office of Education research and development activities emphasizing systematic efforts to increase knowledge relating to education or to develop and explore new approaches to education were to be transferred. The budget of a program whose basic task was to create new knowledge or solutions was transferred to NIE. On the other hand the budget of a

program whose main objective was to assist education consumers in the use of the tools already possessed remained in the Office of Education.

An important aspect of the work of the Planning Unit was not only to set goals and objectives for the Institute but also to identify the obstacles to be faced in achieving them. The obstacles noted by the unit were (1) unequal access, (2) barriers to participation, (3) decreasing productivity, and (4) lack of substance. It was recommended that certain factors in the programs suggested to overcome these obstacles be changed namely, laws, incentives, information and delivery.[27]

At the end of July, 1972, the Planning Unit presented a proposed NIE organization, a programmatic organization reflecting suggestions for successful research and development: (1) National Council on Educational Research consisting of fifteen members to guide the activities of the Institute; (2) Office of the Director, to provide national leadership in educational research; (3) Center for Education Policy Research to provide a balanced R&D perspective on the entire field of education for the Institute; (4) Office of Management to provide primary staff support for decision-making by the Director. Other suggested offices were Office of Administration, Office of Resource Development, Office of Applied Studies,

---

[27]National Institute of Education, Planning Status as of July 31, 1972, pp. 3-4.

*Office of National Programs, and Office of Resource Utilization.*

The primary responsibility of the Planning Unit was to chart directions and activities for the Institute's research and development programs. In the spring of 1972, four groups were asked to prepare discussion papers aimed at providing a strong basis for NIE's research and development operations. The groups were head by Senta Raizen and Beverly Kooi, members of the Planning Unit, Amitai Etzioni from the Center for Policy Research, Columbia University and O. W. Markley of the Stanford Research Institute. The Rand Corporation was also commissioned to study a number of alternatives for the proposed Institute's organizational structure. Their reports have been used from time to time in ongoing planning efforts at the Institute.

V. The First Year

A. Organizational Structure

With the appointment on August 1, 1972 of Emerson Elliott, a member of the Planning Unit, as Acting Director, and the transfer of certain programs and personnel from the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education made its first steps. By November 1, 1972, the Institute had its first Director, Thomas K. Glennan, Jr. formerly head of planning, research and evaluation at the Office of Economic Opportunity. The confirmation of the fifteen member National Council on Educational Research in June 1973 by the Senate, fully established the Institute as an operating Federal agency. During the months of waiting for confirmation of the Council, the Institute reviewed programs that were transferred from the Office of Education, and planned new programs to present to the Council.

It is characteristic of new establishments that during the first year firm organizational designs are laid down. This has been no less true of NIE. The organization plan which has been implemented was designed by Dennis Perkins, Assistant Director for Planning and Management in May, 1973. The plan outlined the following components for the Institute:

1. National Council on Educational Research; general policy and review of the Institute.
2. Office of the Director: staff offices, advisors
3. Office of Planning and Management: planning and evaluation,

budget, organization development, management systems, Executive Secretary to the Council, and interagency coordination.

4. Office of Administration: personnel, finance, grants and contracts, general services, management information systems, and the Institute Resource Center; also the development of various financial, programmatic and other systems of an administrative nature designed to improve the operational efficiency of the Institute.
5. Office of Research Grants: field initiated research and systematization of research findings.
6. Office of Research and Exploratory Studies: policy research, pre-program exploratory studies.
7. Office of Programmatic R&D: major operating programs, established upon approval of the National Council on Educational Research.
8. Office of R&D Resources: research relating to the R&D system, and dissemination services.

During the first year much time was devoted to limited administration and review of those programs that were transferred from the Office of Education to determine the extent to which they would help NIE meet its legislative commitment. Emphasis was also placed upon the development of organizational structures, and the hiring of qualified staff. By June 30, 1973 there

were 329 full time employees at the Institute. Additional projects from the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity were transferred to the Institute in July, 1973.

B. Field Initiated Studies Program

The Institute inherited two programs from the Office of Education which provided a strong base for its new Field Initiated Studies program. These were (1) the Basic and Applied Research Program which funded research proposals across a broad range of educational issues such as resource management, educational technology and the learning process; and (2) the Regional Research Program which supported proposals requiring no more than $10,000 in funding and taking no longer than 18 months to complete, and designed to encourage educational research by graduate students and faculty at small institutions.

These two programs were reviewed by NIE. It was then decided in response to the legislative mandate creating the Institute as well to recommendations in the planning documents to support basic studies, to begin a Field-Initiated Studies Program which would build upon the OE programs. Needed changes were to be made in order to pursue the legislative goal.

The Field Initiated Studies Program, January through June 1973 was headed by Thomas D. Clemens. It provided funds for basic research and small development projects in all fields of study relevant to American

education. Between $7-10 million was allocated for the program in Fiscal Year 1973. The major characteristics of this activity were broadly described as (1) the encouragement and support of ideas initiated in the scientific community itself; (2) the encouragement of research devoted to fundamental inquiries about education and the learning process; and (3) the encouragement of research designed to build a knowledge base that will lead to solutions of specific educational programs.

There were three categories of support within the program:

(1) Grants for Research in Education designed for accommodating proposals in any field except those in the "selected disciplines." The proposals to be reviewed fell within five panel areas: (1) Learning and Instruction, (2) Human Development, (3) Objectives, Measurement, Evaluation and Research Methodology, (4) Social Thought and Processes, and (5) Organization and Administration.

(2) Selected Disciplines, designed to attract scholars outside the traditional educational community to study issues in American education. Emphasis for the competition in 1973 was on political science, economics, anthropology and legal research.

(3) Small Grants Research designed to encourage inexperienced investigators who have not yet established a record of research productivity.

Proposals were initially reviewed by NIE staff supported by personnel from other Federal agencies, and other field readers, and then by panels composed of non-governmental specialists. Following panel review all grants recommended for funding were finally reviewed for approval or modification by the Director of NIE or his designee.

There were 3,676 proposals and prospectus in the amount of $372,538,000 submitted to the 1973 Grants Award Program. Proposals came from every State in the United States in addition to Puerto Rico, The Virgin Islands and a number of foreign countries. The Institute funded 193 proposals amounting to $10,363,000. Of this total 41% of awards and 64% of funds were focused in the Grants for Research in Education Program; 36% of awards and 6% of funds were focused in the Small Grants, and 23% of awards and 30% of funds were focused in the Selected Disciplines Program. Colleges and Universities submitted 80% of all proposals and received 80% of the funds, while Schools of Education submitted 30% of all the proposals and received 33% of the proposals funded. Of the number of awards made 63% were less than 19 months in duration.

On July 10, 1973, John Mays, then Acting Associate Director, Office of Research Grants presented the Institute's proposed Research Grants Program to the National Council on Educational Research. The paper emphasized the objectives and strategy as well as the major issues involved in the Research Grants Program. The primary objective of the program is to help in the fulfilment of the general objective of the Institute

i.e., the attainment of equal opportunity to receive high quality education, through strengthening of the scientific and technological foundations of education. The Council responded with a resolution on August 6, 1973, endorsing the Research Grants Program activities as a means of improving education for all Americans. The Council adopted the general policy that 10% to 15% of the Institute's resources may be allocated to the Research Grants Program.

C. Research and Exploratory Studies

The Office of Research and Explorotory Studies is engaged in three principal kinds of studies concerned with (a) a broad spectrum of policy research issues, employing current theory to evaluate options available to decision-makers; (b) exploratory activities to more precisely define a particular problem; and (c) development of a program of research designed to address that problem. Almost all of the funds for Fiscal Year 1973 were spent on funding prior commitments and projects transferred from the Office of Education. These include the four Career Education Models, D. C. school project, experimental school projects and related evaluation, over 60 projects administered earlier under the educational laboratory and R&D Centers program, in addition to some $7 million worth of backdated project from the Office of Education.

Major ongoing projects at the Office of Research and Exploratory Studies include the study on Education Goals, the study on School Success, the study on Desegregation, the pilot study on teacher expectations and

their classroom effects, and the income maintenance experiment and the educational effects of this experiment.

D. Research and Development Resources

The main purpose of the Office of Research and Development Resources is to build an effective research and development system thereby trying to fulfil one of the four legislative objectives of the Insitute. For a number of months a task force has attempted to develop ways by which the Institute can build linkages between research and practice and also assure availability of personnel and institutions to do research. Referrals for Proposals announcements will be made and contracts will be awarded. Funding will be on a yearly basis, although commitments to future funding may be multi-year.

By January 1973, decisions were made to discontinue certain activities in the R&D Resources Office. These include a program that was designed to identify promising educational practices, and a program aimed at identifying what might go into an education dissemination activity, or the problems of assessment and evaluation, or the best way to make use of technology. The continuation of 16 Educational Research information clearinghouses at an average cost of $275,000 a clearinghouse must be specially noted. The objective of the ERIC system is to provide quick access to an ever growing file of currently screened literature relevant to education. Commitments made by the Office of Education, including pilot state and local linkage projects and researcher training activities were

also funded during 1973. The latter was disbanded in October 1973.

One of the principal activities of the Office of R&D Resources during 1973 has been the development of a plan for dissemination. The plan seeks to develop a system to improve the utilization of knowledge in order that the legislative objectives of the Institute can be fully met. The major programs in the plan for the delivery of information are: (1) modification of the existing ERIC system; (2) design and development of an advanced education information system; (3) information transformation and analysis; (4) research, technology, experimentation and evaluation; and (5) information system operations. The plan is intended to result in an evolutionary change from the current ERIC to a new Educational Information System (EIS) by 1978.

The Institute sponsored a Study Group on Linguistic Communication in August 1973. The group met in the Hyannis area of Massachusetts from August 13 to 24, 1973. The purpose of the study Group was to recommend a program of research and development on learning and instruction in the elements of linguistic communication-reading, writing, listening, speaking-including interactions among these elements. The group is in the final stages of writing its recommendations for an NIE reading program.

Programmatic Research and Development

In career education much emphasis has been placed on research and development efforts to improve the relation between education and a career. The target populations have been (1) young people seeking their first

employment and (2) mid-career adults seeking mid-career advancement or change. The needs of women and minorities are given prime consideration.

All 68 projects of the R&D centers were reviewed. A change in funding from institutional support to individual program purchase has been effected for the R&D laboratories and centers. The laboratories and centers must now compete for funds from the Instititue on an equal basis with all other public and private organizations.

A full review of all experimental school sites has been completed and a thorough evaluation of the overall project is in process. The education voucher program which has been transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity has also been reviewed and has been approved for expansion to include a broader variety of models and types of target populations.

E. International Aspects

The Institute sponsored an International Conference on Cultural Transmission in August, 1973. The Conference was held in Oskosh, Wisconsin. It brought together a number of international scholars in anthropology and the social sciences to examine education as it relates to cultural transmission. The central focus was on the theoretical work of Professor Frederick Gearing at the State University of New York, Buffalo, and the related studies of Professor Francis Ianni at Teachers' College, Columbia University. Professor Gearing and his group are in the process of articulating a General Theory of Education to be valid for processes of cultural transmission cross-culturally.

The Institute has also contributed to the work of the Center for Educational Research and Development in Paris, France, in an attempt to help promote the development of research activities in education. Another objective established for the Center by the Council of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is to promote the development of cooperation between member countries in the field of educational research and development.

In collaboration with the Irish Department of Education, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation and the Spencer Foundation the National Institute of Education is participating in a giant three-year project (1973-76) in Ireland. The project which will be jointly undertaken by Boston College and St. Patrick's College in Dublin, Ireland, will introduce standardized testing into selected Irish schools and study the effects of tests on education expectations, perceptions and decisions of students, teachers and parents. The project will provide a remarkable opportunity to study the factors which hinder or enhance an experimental approach to educational reform.

VI. Summary and Conclusion

The National Institute of Education, like any other new organization or agency, has had growing pains during its first year. While there has been setbacks there have been also successes and accomplishments. Some projects, transferred from the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity have been phased out while others have been kept for

future funding. The Institute has reviewed and revised these programs during its first year.

Other aspects of the work of the Institute during the first year include: (1) the development of new initiatives, including a research grants or a field initiated studies program; (2) the evolution of organizational structure, which, it is hoped will be responsive to the management needs of the Institute, and the selection of many key personnel; (3) the development of management systems, designed not only to meet the Instiute's administrative needs but also to meet the special needs of researchers.

The Institute has been refining its objectives and priorities, and will continue research and developmental efforts in such important areas as the training of teachers, technology, basic skills, and the disadvantaged. In this way it is hoped that a solid foundation will be laid for future programs in educational research and development that would lead to the improvement of American education.